



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

one in the collection hitherto published. It is to be found in "Truth from Jean Paul's Life," vol. 5, p. 98, and is dated April 24th, 1796. In the six volumes of the "Truth" which Otto and Förster edited, the letters are often abridged, and that part of this printed letter corresponding to what is in the manuscript is no exception to the rule. As, however, the printed letter contains three times as much as the part corresponding to the four pages of manuscript, it is plain that the letter was a long one, and as it related mainly to Ahlefeldt's love for Frau Kropf, the surmise arises that Frau Kropf's first letter to Richter may have been in part inspired by the hope that he would have an influence in controlling Ahlefeldt's passion for her,—a wife and mother.

The letters are marked by the glowing extravagance in expression of the period, and the earlier ones exhibit the warmest admiration; but decline somewhat in fervor towards the end and offer excuses for the omission of attentions. The last one, containing the expression about "the trinity of three persons in one Godhead of friendship," intimates some coolness on the part of Frau Kropf. That is also true of one or two others. The letters like all of Richter's correspondence with women are instructive as to the relations of literary men at that time, and exhibit Richter as a sort of high-priest of sentimentalism. They illustrate an episode in his life and throw light on his character. It is the Richter who soars and sings that is here represented; but not without a touch perhaps of the Richter that waddled and cackled. His place in literature is certainly unique.

Prof. H. H. Boyesen, of Columbia College, made a few remarks on this paper. He does not consider the author of these letters by any means a good model of style. Richter's language is turgid and chaotic. His Titanism assumes chiefly the form of a protest against conventional morals. He is intellectually so remote from our age as to make him a literary curiosity. His works give to the ideal the victory over the real, a procedure that is just the contrary to what modern novelists follow. The speaker characterized in broad lines the eighteenth century fiction of Germany, and noted the position that Richter held with his contemporaries at home and abroad.

The next contribution, by Prof. J. M. Hart, of the University of Cincinnati, was read by Prof. T. W. Hunt, of Princeton.

2. This paper, on "The College Course in English Literature, how it may be Improved," touched upon some of the more general needs and defects of our present system of instruction in English Literature.

After premising that the course should be extended through three entire years, two if not three full hours per week, the paper first suggested the necessity of excluding from the study of literature such purely formal disciplines as Logic and Rhetoric. Logic is rapidly drifting into the domain of experimental science. As to Rhetoric, it has no more to do with English literature than with Greek or German. It can not aid us in understanding English *thought* and *feeling*, which is after all the object of literary study.

As to the value of Anglo-Saxon in a course of English Literature, the writer expressed his doubts. There is no continuity of *thought* between England before and after the Norman Conquest. The interest in Anglo-Saxon is chiefly linguistic and historic. But if Anglo-Saxon be taught, the writer expressed his desire for a change of method. Instead of attempting such a difficult work as *Beowulf*, the student should be familiarized with Wessex prose, such as may be found in Sweet's Reader. If any poetry be read, the most available piece is *Elene*, admirably edited by Zupitza. At all events every *teacher* of literature should be well grounded in Anglo-Saxon, as the easiest and safest way of understanding peculiarities of modern speech. Examples were given from Mr. Hales's *Longer English Poems*, to show what gross blunders an accomplished literary critic might make through ignorance of Anglo-Saxon philology. A word of caution was also uttered against treating Chaucer too readily as a fair representative of modern thought.

The paper then touched upon the necessity of teaching the literature by periods. The first great period ended with Milton, who was—as Matthew Arnold has aptly observed—the last of the immortals. The first period—Spencer, Sidney, and Milton aside—is chiefly dramatic, centering around Shakespeare. As to Shakespeare, the writer suggested that he was not properly studied. He was isolated too much, whereas a clear perspective of his greatness could be got only by comparing him with his predecessors and successors. For general information concerning the origin and growth of the English Drama, sufficient for class-room lectures could be got from the treatises by Mr. Ward and Mr. Symonds. But that is not enough. The pupils should read copious extracts from the dramatists before and after Shakespeare. But here, unfortunately, proper helps are wanting. There is no book in the least adequate. Marlowe's *Edward II.* and *Faustus*, with Greene's *Friar Bacon*, are to be had in the Clarendon Press editions, with good notes. But there is at present no satisfactory means of acquainting the student with Lily, Greene, Peele, Ben. Jonson, Chapman, Ford, Webster, &c. Mr. Morley's *English Plays* is a very cumbersome book, the text carelessly printed, notes meagre and misleading, and the selections not always judicious.

The second period begins with Dryden and ends with Samuel Johnson. The circumstance that Dryden's authorship overlaps that

of Milton only serves to throw into more startling contrast the old and the new. This second period has less poetic interest. Enough illustrations of the poetry can be got from Mr. Hales's *Longer English Poems*. The main work will be upon prose. Matthew Arnold's edition of Johnson's *Lives*, with Minto's *Manual of English Prose*, will give sufficient occupation. Mr. Minto's *Manual*, in particular, is one of the best planned text-books in existence.

The third period begins, for poetry at least, with Wordsworth. For prose, it is less easy to decide upon a land-mark. We all feel the difference between Gibbon, for instance, and De Quincey, but no one prose author resembles Wordsworth in embodying the transition. Perhaps Scott may suffice. He certainly has in him traits of both the eighteenth and nineteenth century styles. The period should end with the year 1860, at the latest. For the reason that Swinburne, Rossetti, and their associates are leaders in a movement of which we cannot yet make a forecast. We ourselves are too much entangled in it to state it with sufficient clearness in the class-room.

The paper then dwelt upon several pressing needs (1) of a history of the English people especially adapted to *literary* study. Such a book might be undertaken by Mr. Mullinger, for instance, to illustrate school and university life, the contrast between town and country, between London and the smaller towns, political and religious controversies as they have directly influenced the habits of authors, the mutual attitude of churchmen and dissenters, of aristocracy and bourgeoisie. All these points are involved in a right understanding of English authors. Yet an American can scarcely grasp them without more direct help than he now gets. (2) The need of a special treatise upon the *foreign* relations of English Literature. English authors have at all times been deeply affected by foreign thought and taste. Yet their critics and biographers seem to persistently ignore this influence. For instance, the writers of the *English Men of Letters Series*. As a sample of what may be done to clear up obscure points, attention was called to Kissner's dissertation on the indebtedness of Chaucer to Italian, and to Landmann's recent dissertation on Euphuism. The writer suggested that the proper way to approach the subject would be to begin with Continental literature as a foundation, and trace its manifestations in English. (3) The need of a concise but accurate manual of English metres. Guest's work is absurdly wrong and not worth the reprinting. Schipper's, when complete, will give all that anyone can desire. But it is of course too voluminous for class-room use. It seems quite possible to give, within the compass of two hundred and fifty pages, specimens of every leading metre used by English poets since Chaucer's day. These specimens might offer good poetry as well as good metre. There would still be room in the volume for historical explanation. The writer expressed his confident belief that such a book would in-

fuse new life into the study of our poetry and disabuse the student's mind of the suspicion that metrical terms are an unmeaning jargon. It would enable the teacher to show how thought and metre correspond.

The reader followed this paper with some remarks on what he considered to be desirable, or even necessary, factors in the teaching of English. In the first place, Rhetoric should be classed as an essential part in this branch of instruction, and, then, too, Anglo-Saxon and Early English ought to form an integral part in the work. According to his view, the best way to effect an improvement, as spoken of in the paper, would be to introduce into the primary schools a good, historical study of our mother tongue and, afterwards, in College, to give the same number of hours to the modern languages as is put down for Greek and Latin. Furthermore, if teachers should be writers, active producers in the field of literature, they would be respected in their callings and regarded as living members of the body corporate of scholars.

Prof. March, of Lafayette College, also thought the teacher must be improved. If the Greek professor were put in a Chair for English, and given the same number of classical authors to read as are now taken from the Greek, there would be little demand for elevating English studies. The matter would soon right itself.

Prof. McElroy, of the University of Pennsylvania, agreed with Prof. March as to the fundamental needs of this department: better teachers and more time are prime necessities if we expect to obtain satisfactory results in teaching.

3. Prof. H. C. G. von Jagemann, of Earlham College, then read a scientific paper on "The Genitive in Old French."

Some years ago, a German teacher published a pamphlet, in which he wished to show that Latin and Modern French could be taught by the same rules. The idea was not a bad one, for there are certainly many points in which Latin and French usage resemble each other very closely, but, unfortunately, the points of difference are so numerous that it would be utterly impracticable to teach a boy Latin and French at the same time, without completely confusing him. On the other hand, if a student is already well grounded in the fundamental rules of Latin syntax, constant reference to the same must be regarded